

## **REMARKS**

This responds to the Final Office Action mailed on September 21, 2009. Reconsideration and continued examination is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

### **Status of Claims**

Claims 27-43 are pending in the instant application. In particular, claims 27-39 have been rejected based on prior art, while claims 1-26 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. In addition, new dependent claims 40 -43 have been added to the instant application.

### **§103 Rejection of the Claims**

Claims 27-29, 31-36, 38 and 39 have rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,356,530) in view of Holland et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,507,867), while claims 31 and 37 are rejected as being unpatentable over Kim and Holland in view of Pettersen (U.S. Patent No. 6,826,594) and in further view of Jeffrey (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0083090). The Applicant respectfully traverses the above rejections.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action did not make out a *prima facie* case of obviousness in connection with any of the rejections because even if combined, the cited references fail to teach or suggest all of the elements of the Applicant's claimed invention or otherwise render the claims as being obvious.<sup>1</sup>

With respect to independent claim 27, the Examiner asserts that Kim discloses "a system for converting interactive Internet content to a form suitable for distribution to clients with a limited or non-existent return channel while preserving the interactivity of the content, the system comprising: a storage media comprising program code and a plurality of data structures, the plurality of data structures including a Page URL data structure storing data for use in identifying pages of interactive content...a Page Partition data structure storing data for use in tracking partitions that make up a page of interactive content...a Partition Link data structure storing data for use in tracking navigation data contained in a partition...a processor to execute the program code to enable the system to selecting and partitioning one or more pages of interactive Internet content."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> M.P.E.P. §2142 (citing *In re Vaack*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991))

<sup>2</sup> See Office Action at Page 3.

Although the Examiner admits that Kim fails to specifically disclose a “means for integrating data stored in the Page URL, Page Partition, and Partition Link data structures and partitions into a bundle; and means for distributing the bundle to a client device”, the Examiner contends that Holland discloses “means for integrating data stored in the Page URL, Page Partition, and Partition Link data structures and partitions into a bundle...means for distributing the bundle to a client device”.<sup>3</sup> The Examiner then concludes “...it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant’s invention to have combined Holland with Kim, since it would have allowed for efficient transfer of page components into a single packet.”<sup>4</sup>

In addition, although the Examiner admits that the Kim reference also fails to disclose the claim limitation of “partitioning each individual page into a plurality of partitions”, the Examiner asserts that the Pettersen reference discloses the claim limitation of “partitioning each individual page into a plurality of partitions...[and that] it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant’s invention to have combined Pettersen with Kim, since it would have allowed a user to store page portions independently.”<sup>5</sup>

Independent claim 27 as previously amended recites, in part, a “system for converting interactive Internet content to a form suitable for distribution to clients with a limited or non-existent return channel while preserving the interactivity of the content, the system comprising a storage media including program code and a plurality of data structures, ... and a processor to execute the program code to enable the system to select and partition a single page of the interactive Internet content into the plurality of partitions, to integrate data stored in the Page URL, Page Partition, and Partition Link data structures and partitions into a bundle, and to distribute the bundle to a client device.”<sup>6</sup>

Kim relates to a “technique by which multiple Web pages can be dynamically bundled and downloaded for accessing on a user’s workstation, [thereby] enabling the user to perform a meaningful transaction even in the absence of an ongoing network connection.”<sup>7</sup> In one embodiment, a “search engine 10...includes a crawler 12 to fetch pages from the Web 13...The

---

<sup>3</sup> See Office Action at Pages 2-3.

<sup>4</sup> See Office Action at Pages 3-4.

<sup>5</sup> *Id.*

<sup>6</sup> Emphasis Added.

<sup>7</sup> See Abstract.

crawler 12 stores the fetched pages in a Web page database 14, which includes data structures optimized for fast access of the fetched pages...”<sup>8</sup> However, Kim fails to teach or suggest partitioning a single page into a plurality of partitions as noted by the Examiner Kim can only partition a particular page into a single partition and not partition a single page into a plurality of partitions as presently claimed by the Applicant.<sup>9</sup> The Examiner contends that Pettersen discloses the claim limitation of “partition[ing] each individual page into a plurality of partitions.”<sup>10</sup>

Pettersen relates to a “method for inserting dynamic content into a web page [which] uses a dynamic code content embedded in the web page.”<sup>11</sup> As shown in FIGS. 12A and 12B of Pettersen, the method requires a “web page owner [define] one or more areas or zones (i.e., smart zones) of a web page ... as remotely managed and then connects [the smart zones] to the content serving web site ... to manage the smart zones by identifying dynamic content to be inserted in them.”<sup>12</sup> Pettersen continues “...[that] dynamic content is inserted into a web page...by use of a dynamic content code or tag embedded within the web page...when intending to define a designated area (i.e., smart zone) for remote content management.”<sup>13</sup> Pettersen recites that “[...]to facilitate this process, each merchant may be provided with a unique merchant ID which is required to be the first portion of the index or key to each destination link, so that the uniqueness of each table entry is ensured and so that no conflicts will arise between different merchants. The... process parses the merchant file and automatically inserts entries into the dynamic lookup table.”<sup>14</sup> As such, Pettersen is directed to embedding dynamic content, such as advertisements, into differently defined smart zones of a particular web page by a remote web page management system that uses a dynamic lookup table to determine which portion of the web page to embed the dynamic content. This type of remote management system of Pettersen fails to teach or suggest the claim limitation of “...a processor to execute the program code to enable the system to select and partition a single page of the interactive Internet content into the plurality of partitions...” Pettersen is limited to embedding dynamic content into a web page

---

<sup>8</sup> See Col. 4, lines 30-44.

<sup>9</sup> See Office Action at Page 4.

<sup>10</sup> *Id.*

<sup>11</sup> See Pettersen at Abstract.

<sup>12</sup> *Id.* at Col. 7, lines 47-52.

<sup>13</sup> *Id.* at Col. 7, lines 59-64.

<sup>14</sup> *Id.* at Col. 18, lines 24-30 and FIG. 4.

using a dynamic lookup table, rather than partitioning a single page of Internet content into a plurality of partitions. Similarly, Holland and Jeffrey also fail to teach or suggest this claim limitation of partitioning a single page into a plurality of partitions and thus fail to overcome the defect.

Based on the foregoing, a prima facie case of obviousness cannot be established by the Examiner since the cited art does not teach or suggest every claim element of independent claim 27 or otherwise render the claims as being obvious. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw his rejection of independent claim 27 and indicate the allowance thereof. Similarly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw his rejection of independent claim 34, which includes the corresponding claim limitation of partitioning a single page into a plurality of partitions, and is allowable for the same reasons as independent claim 27. The Examiner is also respectfully requested to withdraw the rejections of dependent claims 28-33 and 35-39 by virtue of their respective dependencies from independent claims 27 and 34 and indicate the allowance thereof. In addition, new claims 40-43 depend directly from independent claims 27 and 34, respectively, and are allowable by virtue of their respective dependencies from the above independent claims.

*Bickmore Article*

During the first interview with the Applicant's representative the Examiner cited an article authored by Timothy Bickmore et al. entitled "Web Page Filtering and Re-Authoring for Mobile Users" (Bickmore article) dated August 18, 1998. The Examiner stated during the interview that the Bickmore article in combination with the Kim and Holland references rendered independent claims 27 and 34 unpatentable. The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection of the claims.

With respect to independent claim 27, the Examiner asserted during the interview that the Kim and Holland references disclose the limitations of claim 27 as discussed above, except the claim limitation of "...a processor to execute the program code to enable the system to select and partition a single page of the interactive Internet content into a plurality of partitions..." However, the Examiner cited new prior art; namely, the Bickmore article which the Examiner asserts as disclosing the claim limitation of "...a processor to execute the program code to enable the system to select and partition a single page of the interactive Internet content into a plurality

of partitions...”

Bickmore relates to a “system [that] automatically converts web-based documents designed for desktop viewing into formats appropriate for handheld devices with small display screens.”<sup>15</sup> In particular, Bickmore recites that a Digestor system applies “...syntactic techniques [which] operate on the structure of the page.”<sup>16</sup> The Digestor system uses a “...transform [that] takes an input page, segments the content into sub-pages by allocating some number of items to each and builds and prepends an index page to the collection.”<sup>17</sup> As such, Bickmore requires the intermediate step of segmenting a web page in order to construct an index page before the user may view individual segments since the index page is the basis for viewing any sub-page segmented by the Digestor system as illustrated in FIG. 4 of the Bickmore article.

Bickmore also recites “[that] if a single logical element cannot fit on an output page then a secondary partitioning is performed that partitions text blocks on paragraph or sentence boundaries”.<sup>18</sup> Moreover, Bickmore states “[that] [t]he index page itself may need to be segmented”.<sup>19</sup> In contrast, the term “partition” as recited in independent claims 27 and 34 and disclosed in the specification, refers to “partitioning the ...image into a set of bit-mapped images wherein each image in said set of bit-mapped images is suitable for display on the output device.”<sup>20</sup> In view of the definition of “partition” recited in the specification, the claim limitation in which the processor “partition[s] a single page of interactive Internet content into the plurality of partitions”<sup>21</sup> necessarily requires that each of the plurality of partitions be suitable for display in its entirety by the output device with no further partitioning being required. This is in contrast to the teachings of Bickmore, which require the intermediate step of constructing an index page prior to allowing the user to view individual segments of the index page, rather than partitioning a single page of Internet content that is distributed directly to the client device. Kim, Holland and Jeffries also fail to teach or suggest this claim limitation of partitioning a single page into a plurality of partitions.

Based on the foregoing, a prima facie case of obviousness cannot be established by the

---

<sup>15</sup> See Bickmore at Abstract.

<sup>16</sup> See Bickmore at 538

<sup>17</sup> *Id.*

<sup>18</sup> *Id.*

<sup>19</sup> *Id.*

<sup>20</sup> See Sequeira at Paragraph 11.

<sup>21</sup> See Claims 27 and 34.

Examiner because the cited prior art, namely, Kim, Holland and Bickmore, do not teach or suggest every claim limitation of independent claim 27 or otherwise render the claims as being obvious. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw his rejection of independent claim 27 and indicate the allowance thereof. Similarly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw his rejection of independent claim 34, which includes the same claim limitation of partitioning a single page into a plurality of partitions, and is allowable for the same reasons as independent claim 27. The Examiner is also respectfully requested to withdraw the rejections of dependent claims 28-33 and 35-39 by virtue of their respective dependencies from independent claims 27 and 34 and indicate the allowance thereof. In addition, new claims 40-43 depend directly from independent claims 27 and 34, respectively, and are allowable by virtue of their respective dependencies from the above independent claims.

### **CONCLUSION**

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's representative at (314) 552-6855 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1662.

Respectfully submitted,  
POLSINELLI SHUGHART PC

Date: December 21, 2009

/Ari M. Bai/  
Ari M. Bai, Reg. No. 38,726  
100 South Fourth Street, Suite 1100  
St. Louis, Missouri 63102-1825  
Telephone: (314) 552-6855  
Fax: (314) 231-1776  
Email: [abai@polsinelli.com](mailto:abai@polsinelli.com)  
Attorney for Applicant